

**BUTTE COUNTY
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMISSION
Friday, January 18, 2002
Minutes**

Held at the Oroville Library, the meeting called to order at 9:09 a.m.

Item 1: Introductions

Commissioners present: Patricia Cragar, Gary House, Mark Lundberg, Sandra Machida, Linda Moore, and Gene Smith, Chair.

Commissioners absent: Jane Dolan, Marian Gage, and Deborah Rowell.

Staff present: Gina Ellena, and Eva Puciata.

Staff absent: Cheryl Giscombe.

Item 2: Agenda Review

Agenda Items 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 were moved to after Item 3. Items 6 and 7 were deferred to the February meeting. Item 8 (the closed session) was moved to the end of the meeting.

Item 3: Approval of Minutes. Approval of 11.30.01 *DRAFT* meeting minutes.

Sandra Machida moved to accept the November 30, 2001 minutes as written. Patricia Cragar seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Item 9: Meeting Schedule Recommendation from Commissioner Cragar

Patricia Cragar said she and Gary House have a meeting immediately after the monthly Commission meeting and would like Commission meetings to start a half hour earlier, to allow a little more time between the meetings.

Patricia Cragar moved that future monthly meetings be from 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. Sandra Machida seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 10: School Readiness Commissioner Committee Report

Gene Smith reported Marian, Linda, Sandra and he have been attending the School Readiness Task Force meetings. Members have been working with various models of School Readiness, and are working with the six-targeted schools to see how they want to participate. Smaller workgroups will meet next week to see which School Readiness models will work. Have completed an agreement with BCOE, for the School Readiness Coordinator package, and are shooting for the May application deadline.

Sandra Machida reported an ad hoc meeting met and hashed out questions for the different focus groups. All the partners (25 at the last meeting) will meet in early February, and then small focus groups will meet subsequently.

Gary House asked whether the School Readiness project would still be a 4-year project, having delayed to Phase II, and Gene said yes, it is still a 4-year project with continuous funding. Hope to leverage some of the funding--the one to one match need not be just Commission monies, but can be a partner match.

Gary asked whether the School Readiness Coordinator position is entirely funded by the Commission. It is totally Commission funded, coming out of the \$100K Implementation monies, and will partner with Project REWARDS through BCOE.

Sandra said Jerry Allred wanted Commission representation on the job interview. Gina Ellena will be on the panel, which will meet from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. on January 31. Sandra and Gene said they might be available to serve on the panel.

Item 11: Project REWARD Commissioner Committee Report

Gene Smith reported the monies from the State Commission for Project REWARD have been received. Several implementation items needed to be worked out to combine the project with the Local Planning Council's, County Office of Education's AB 212, and also work with Employment and Social Services, who is contributing a large sum of funds.

A Scope of Work and Implementation Proposal has been developed with the two collaborative partners, BCOE and Valley Oak Children's Services. These partners will coordinate out-reach efforts.

Gene explained the proposal page by page.

The management team overseeing Project REWARD is Gene Smith, Linda Moore, Cheryl Giscombe, Jeff Fontana (Social Services), a rep. from Valley Oak Children's Services, and one from BCOE.

Gene recognized Gloria Balch, Heather Senske, and Jeff Fontana for their work in developing the Scope of Work and Implementation Proposal, about which all partners are comfortable and enthusiastic. The proposal needs put in place ASAP to stop losing qualified teachers; hopefully the contracts can be done by the end of March. Gene asked the Commission to approve the documents and the subcontracts.

Mark Lundberg asked about the matching funds. \$250K is coming from our Commission monies, \$250K from the State, and \$250K from Cal WORKS. The State match is available thru June 30, 2003.

Sandra asked about how stipends would be distributed. It was explained this a detail yet to be worked out. Other counties have set application timelines. A survey might be in order for the application period. There was discussion regarding \$800K in yearly revenues, and hoping to move as much of it out the door.

Gina asked what the contract period would be. The period would have an intended completion date of June 30, 2003, but have follow-up for the next 6-months. January 2, 2002 is the start date.

Gary asked if the State monies have to be spent by June 30, 2003, and asked Staff to ask the State about the timeline to spend the money.

Sandra asked about the intent of REWARDS: to reward the people working in the field now, and link professional development in the second year? There was discussion about how the connections will be made, how professional development opportunities will be made. Probably a pool of initial applicants, and then some will continue on in the second year, and then another pool of applicants. If applicants do not secure training they will not be eligible for the continuing stipend.

Patricia Cragar moved to approve the Implementation Proposal and subcontracts with Valley Oak and BCOE, and direct staff to follow up and answer questions about the encumbrance. Sandra Machida seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 12: Contract Awards Commissioner Committee Report

Patricia Cragar reported the Contract Awards Committee met to look at the feedback from applicants, commissioners, and staff. The recommendations are listed on the Award's Committee Minutes: 1. Assign table leaders for each review team. A table leader sits with and set the parameters of the review

process. (We had Martha Saly and Gina circulating between 3 tables.) Having table leaders would help record comments. 2. Strengthen orientation of readers in making comments and score one application together before teams begin scoring. 3. Add a logic model to the RFP application. 4. Prioritize focus areas and activities. 5 Consider a streamlined process for small grants of \$1000 or \$5000.

Sandra said Gina is tracking what focus areas are covered and how much monies are spent in the Mini-Grants. Discussion that awards have spoken to the major Strategic Plan areas; it's a matter of tracking and becoming clear about the process.

Staff was directed to write letters to the three RFP process complaintents, thanking them for their letters and addressing the feelings expressed. The letters were listed in the Correspondence list. The complaints were about the reading process, readers influencing others, misunderstanding of Commission priorities, and comments included in the final document to the Awards Committee were inappropriate (comments were not germane to strength of proposals).

Patricia Cragar made a motion that the Commission accept the Awards Committee Recommendations as listed on the Awards Minutes, recognizing that two or more might need more discussion. Sandra Machida seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Patricia Cragar made a motion that the Awards Policy be accepted as written. Gary House seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Mark asked Gina whether any mini-grantees are in trouble, will they not fulfill their goals? None were in trouble; two would like to make modifications that exceed 10% of the budget. A Process for Contract Modification is included the Staff Report.

Gary asked the Awards Committee to look at the Contract Modification Process and make a recommendation to the full Commission. There was discussion that the Contract Modification document is ready to use; perhaps just a telephone conference will render a final document. Perhaps the mini-grant time extensions need deferred until after the prioritization training in February.

There had been a complaint made about staff doing the RFP budget reduction process.

Patricia Cragar made a motion that all complaints, concerns, and accolades be directed to the Program Manager. Sandra Machida seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 13: Staff Report

Gina Ellena reported the CFC and Association would be presenting a Legislative Platform at the annual meeting in March. Changes are still being accepted.

Gene asked that some time during the February meeting be set aside to talk about the CFC Assoc. Legislative Platform. Patricia asked Staff to make a list of recommended Platform changes.

Gina reported our Association dues are about \$694 per year. The fee structure has not been determined, but is based on number of births per year. Whether to continue Association membership will have to be decided in March.

Gina said Commissioners Marian Gage, Linda Moore, and Deborah Rowell's terms would be expiring in April. Deborah does not wish to serve another term. Marian and Linda want to continue. The Commission needs to recommend Commission appointees to the Board of Supervisors. Gary explained the Board of Supervisors appoints members to the Commission. Originally notices were posted in the papers soliciting Letters of Interest per category. A questionnaire went out to each respondent, requesting more information. A subcommittee of the Board met to review all information, and then made recommendations to the full Board. We have to decide how we want to proceed at this time.

Discussion was whether an existing Commission committee is in charge of appointing new members. The Butte County ordinance says only that the Board is the appointing entity for Commissioners. Those counties with a separate entity Commission have vacancy procedures in their bylaws.

Gary recommended Gene write a letter to the Board of Supervisors, asking how they would like to fill the vacancy. **Gene asked Gina to draft a letter to the Board.** The Board will probably ask the Commission for guidance.

Gina said the Chair and Vice Chair have one-year terms. How are other officers going to be chosen? **Gary suggested that it be put on the February Agenda, and we can nominate and vote.** The Vice Chair does not automatically move up to be Chair.

Gina said UCLA was asked to come up and give training in prioritization (3-4 hours), and TASC was asked to come up to train in Fiscal Management, Sustainability, and Fiscal Leveraging (2-3 hours). Gina was instructed to set up **a training day for the Commissioners: Feb. 19 is the first choice, and Feb. 21 the second choice.**

Cheryl recommended the Commission consider prioritizing future funding allocations to address fragmented service delivery. An example from Santa Clara County is enclosed in the packet. It was decided to wait until after the workshops to prioritize future funding.

Marian Gage offered to be on the Association Policy Panel, a presentation of County Commission priorities, which will be given to the State Commission at their February meeting. They need speakers addressing "What Partnerships with the Counties Can Do for the Whole Package." The meeting is in Los Angeles and out of area travel expenses for Marian need prior Commission approval.

Gary House made a motion to approve Marian Gage's travel expenses to the CFC February meeting in Los Angeles. Mark Lundberg seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Eva Puciata explained the financial pages. Monies uncommitted after subtracting monies committed for possible expenditure in this fiscal year are shown on the Financial Summary. The Expenditure and Encumbrance (pink) page is basically copied from the Auditors system, but with earmarked Professional Services monies subtracted out, to show there is only less than \$500K in 536 (Prof. Services). In prior months we thought we could move monies out of 536, but had forgotten the \$500K REWARDS monies from the CFC and Social Services would also go through our budget, not just the Commission commitment of \$250K.

The \$500K from the State has arrived. \$100K in School Readiness has come in. The contract between Social Services and the Commission needs completed before their monies are transferred to us.

Monies set aside for Systems Development (\$500K) was discussed. Gary explained it addressed a priority in the Strategic Plan, the whole data collection: countywide report card, tracking kids, etc. We budgeted it for this year, not knowing whether any progress would be made and haven't started yet.

Eva said Gene Lucas cautioned the Commission (Oct. 29 meeting) that we were over committing. On the (white) Projection pages, all known revenues and expenditures are listed for the next several years. For this fiscal year and the next two, expenses will likely exceed revenues. If the Commission wishes to continue to retain a 2 million reserve, there is about 1.5 million to do something else with, as the lowest the Fund Balance will dip is about 3.5 million in FY 03-04.

Commissioners discussed that perhaps after the UCLA training and prioritization, another mini-grant RFP would be possible.

Gina said she met with all eleven RFP grantees, and has received modified Scopes of Work and Budgets from five. Thus far, \$106K has been cut for the 3-year period. 80% of the savings are in the first year. \$83K of the \$97K needed in the first year are in, and she confident that the needed cuts in big grants budgets will be made.

Gina reported that 50% of the FY has gone by, and 25% of mini-grant funds have been spent. Some mini-grantees will need a contract extension.

Item 4: Mini-Grantee Presentations

Elaine Lucero, Coordinator overseeing the Freedom from Smoking Tobacco Cessation Program for American Lung Association presented. Benchmarks are to reduce use of tobacco products and environmental pollutants, identify and recruit for Freedom from Smoking clinics for pregnant women, and help Butte County caregivers in their personal efforts to quit smoking. Since the grant started they've expanded from 3 facilitators to 9, and hired an Admin. Assistant. Classes are held in Chico, Oroville, and Paradise. Attendance sometimes is low, so classes have to be discontinued. In Gridley and in Oroville, Spanish classes are being planned. Of 117 people registered, 74 have attended cessation classes, and 31 people have actually quit. About 50% of people who quit attend class, and of those, 43% remain smoke-free.

Rachel Muratore reported for the Chico Nursery School. They have been self-supporting and are a parent co-op, requiring much parent participation. Early Care and Education is their focus area, and their grant had three areas of emphasis: One was to give 4 scholarships for families unable to pay tuition. Second area of emphasis is the parent-education program, which has blossomed with the money to bring in speakers from out of town, and purchase parent-ed books (which are being used). Third area was to improve the quality of the facility. Language arts materials, children's reading materials, and new windows for the school have been purchased. The windows helped leverage a better deal for rent with the host church that owns the building the School has been in for 25 years.

Sally Miller, Administrator of Discovery World in Chico, and one of their teachers, Timm Steward, reported. Discovery World is a pre-school serving 28 children age 2 to 5. Facility is a house, with an in-house cook and a very homey atmosphere. Discovery World is funded by the California Dept. of Education and serves low-income families. They are excited about the play yard improvements, although there have been challenges. The fence put up around the play yard in October warped in three weeks and will be fixed in better weather. A place for riding toys has been created. Sally will be stepping down; her successor has not yet been found. Timm Steward will complete the grant project. Timm reported December benchmarks would be met by the end of January: the ordering and installation of the large climber. More equipment (bikes, scooters) will be ordered, as their grant was written for large motor development, which is being documented along with improved safety.

Amy Myles, Health Education Specialist, Butte County Dept. of Public Health, reported for the Child Health and Disability Prevention Program. The three objectives of the grant were to: establish a Butte County Children's Dental Taskforce; to survey dentists and consumers; and to sponsor dental services. 30 people attended the first meeting of the Task Force in December, and strengths and weakness in dental care for children in Butte County were discussed. The dental survey is to identify attitudes and practices regarding children's dental care and determine ways to encourage dentists to accept children with Medi-Cal. The consumer survey is to identify attitudes and experiences, and will include Head Start parents. The mobile dental clinic from USC came up again in November (first time in October 2000) and provided dental services for 111 children the first day (24 were 0-5), with 93 returning for further treatment. CHDP began recruiting children in July thru WIC, foster care, schools, and pre-schools. Amy presented a slide show on the dental van services.

Item 7: Center for Economic Development at California State University, Chico – Community Assessment, Performance Measurement, and Evaluation Proposal

Jim Myers said the CED would like to submit a proposal for services for the Evaluation of Performance Indicators and Program Outcomes. The CED is committed to developing a comprehensive evaluation consistent with the vision of the Commission. They will be supportive of, and work collaboratively with other evaluators to be sure data is fully extracted. The CED has been providing information and analysis to regional decision makers since 1986. Topics have been community health,

environment, planning, and community economic development. CED has 20 employees and interns, with expertise in business administration, public administration, economics, sociology and social work, program evaluation, survey development, data research and analysis, and production of interim and final reports.

There was discussion regarding the \$70K and the \$500K set aside for Evaluation and Systems Development. Questions were asked regarding how ED was solicited for former work for other County Commissions. The BCCFC is not yet ready to go forward with Evaluation. Perhaps as the Mini-Grant process is ended, evaluation process discussion can take place. Myers was asked for a CED Curriculum Vita.

Item 14: Public Input

Gene Smith read a note written to the Commission by Gene Lucas: "At the State Commission meeting yesterday, it was announced that Prop 10 Funds have not been raided in the Governor's Preliminary Budget. There was discussion that other early childhood programs did not fare so well. A large part of the meeting was spent on a panel discussion of informal childcare, limited in the discussion to subsidized care, since they had no statistics on other types of informal care. However, parental and non-commercial care kept sneaking into the discussion, and it was stated over and over informal care was community-peculiar which lead the Commission to surmise that programs in this area would have to be operated at the County level. Mr. Reiner and Dr. Henderson both mentioned partnerships between the State and County (cost-sharing). Highly recommend that BCCFC start planning on how to utilize their reserves to support this kind of activity, as well as school readiness initiative activity. Last, I hope BCCFC will find a way to support home delivery of the Kit for New Parents, especially for Hispanic families. It was pointed out at the Commission meeting that the Kit might be overpowering for these families. Home delivery, with training and motivation, could lessen the impact and improve the effectiveness of the Kit."

Item 8: Closed Session – Annual Evaluation of Program Manager

Those returning after the closed session toured the Valley Oak Children Services Oroville Facility (across the street).

When the closed session ended, Gene Smith reported the results (also to be reported at the beginning of the February meeting): Gary House explained the Program Manager's relationship to the Commission, her relationship as a Term Employee of the County, and his responsibility as her supervisor to do an evaluation. He has completed his supervisory evaluation.

For the Commissioner's evaluation of the Program Manager, Gary suggested each Commissioner independently complete the evaluation forms put in the packets and submit them to Gene by February 8, 2002. Gene will compile them, and Commissioners will meet again in closed session with Cheryl at the February meeting to set goals and provide feedback.

For next year, Gary suggested the Commission do their evaluation prior to the Program Manager's anniversary date and provide input to him as her supervisor. Evaluation forms will be provided to Commissioners in October, in time for completion and submission to Gary before his supervisory evaluation in January 2003.

The meeting adjourned at 12:09 p.m.

Minutes by Eva Puciata.